Preserve ✓

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. ~~2/5~~ 3

Part B for May 23

SUBJECT

Review application from Syed Ishak
Neakkan Road Bangalore praying for a reconsidera
tion of the order appointing Syed Kutbuddin as
Mezavar of Raja Hussain Darga at Balepet

To
The Syed Issac C&M.
Station Bangalore

[illegible] 33)

No: 2798 of 16 8 43.

States that there are no fresh grounds
for re-consideration of the orders already
issued in the matter

Printed on the Multigraph.

M K Easton

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record]

D. 1705. 1) Review application from Syed Issac, Makan Road, Bangalore, praying for a re-consideration of G.O. no. 1973/Muz 32-13 d/ 20-10-1921 appointing his opponent Syed Kutbuddin as Mujawar of Raja Hussein Dargah at Balepet, Bangalore.

2) The Review-petition is duly stamped. The order sought to be reviewed was passed on 29-11-1921 ~~State~~ The Rev. app. [illegible]

and his review application was rejected in order no 6178 D/ 4-5-22.

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be ciroed, or slips pasted o this form.

G R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record]

3) May the Petr be asked to assign reasons for delay in filing the revision?

Sub[illegible]

[illegible] 5/8/23

4) The applⁿ has been presented by a Pleader (not by an advocate). Is such a legal practitioner authorized to appear before Court? KJ 7/8/23

5) May be forwarded to the Judl Secty for opinion

8/8/23.

8/8/23

8/8/23

8/8

N B — Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

G. R. S. III—3]

4590
P

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

---

6) As per section 21 of the Mysore Muzrai Regn, VI of 1913, Appeals under the Regn are treated in the same manner & are subject to the same limitations as appeals under the L R Code.

7) ~~Under~~ Para 3 of ~~the~~ Rule 702 B of the Land Rev Rules (Note ii to para 251 of Rev manual (Vol I)) states that only Advocates will be allowed to appear before Govt, & Advocates or First Grade Pleaders before ~~Rev~~ Commissr.

8) In the present case the petition is for a revision. Since there is no separate procedure prescribed for such case the same rules ~~apply~~ seem to apply, & only an advocate can ~~go~~ appear before Govt.

Ans Subd with file to para 4 infra
13/3

Bring up with a copy of the Revenue manual
5/3

Asst
14/3

9) Muzrai Act?

16/3

~~[illegible]~~

~~[illegible]~~

~~[illegible]~~

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

4

G. R. S. III—3] 8—III

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

The Review Petn has been presented over 1½ months after date and by a Pleader, not an advocate as is reqd by rules. Even if the Petn is not rejected on the 2d ground, it is liable to be rejected for the first ~~can~~ reason. ~~[illegible]~~

The original genealogical tree relied upon for passing the order now ~~[illegible]~~ sought to be reviewed is alleged by the present appellant to be faulty. The Petn may if appd be referred to the Muz: Comr for having the allegations thoroughly investigated and an early report with his own opinion subd. forthwith.

12/3/23

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

Petn:
has to be rejected.

1785 5

S III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

As its presentation by a Pleader is invalid it cannot be recognised. (First [illegible]) [illegible] 9/3/23

7730-603
22.3.23

I agree in the above [illegible]. The petition is also out of time, for which no explanation has been offered.

Rees
23.3.23. [illegible] 23/3/4

Dft. Submitted
A.S.
24.3. 24/3/23

[illegible]
24/3/23

No [illegible] to the petr.
Rejects the petn.

N B -Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions; etc., not intended for permanent record.]

From, Syed Issac, C.S.M.
Station. Bangalore.

Petition dated 20·4·1923

States that he is by caste entitled to get the Muzavarship of Raja Huss Darga in dispute, and requests that he may be given the post in question, and adds that the delay in the presentation of the petition may be condoned.

Submitted for orders

[illegible]

24·4·23

[illegible] as per [illegible]

of the [illegible] to the [illegible]

[illegible]

29/4/23

[illegible]

Please put up Muz. Dis. 32-73 and records [illegible] 1973 [illegible] 32-13-16

[illegible] 10·7·21

27/4/23

N B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

Muz-7-32-13 Dis-16 is put up. Please [illegible]

27/4/23

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

Yes; he was one of the parties to the previous proceedings. In fact it was he that first agitated for the appt & the whole correspondence was [illegible] in the matter of his appeal. [illegible]

27/4/23

The ~~appellant~~ petr had the opportunity of establishing before the Tahsildar during the inquiry that his father Syed Abdul Khadir was uterine brother of Syed Khasim and not his cousin as reported by the D.C. but he failed to do so. Vide abo—

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

8

[illegible]

G R S III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~

It is open to [illegible] [illegible] a [illegible] [illegible] a [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible]

The [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] more than [illegible] minutes after the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] order, [illegible] [illegible] members [illegible] ([illegible] dated 23-3-123) [illegible] may be rejected [illegible]

[illegible] 28/4/23

N B Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

8995-47
2.5.23

I agree. Send accordingly.

[illegible]
4.5.23

S.R.N.
5/5

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

Draft endt. subd.

M.V.
9.5.23. 9/5/23

Issue
9/5/23

No. 2798 d/ 16/5/23
to Syed Josue, Mukkam Road
states that there
are no fresh grounds for
re-considering the orders
already issued in the
matter.

N. B.—Should routine notes be wri
the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on
this form

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

N B Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be clipped, or slips pasted on this form.

10

Muz 4]

SUBJECT ………………………………………………

Diary No. of letter replied to ________

Muzrai Secretariat
( )
the 192

Section
File No. 161-22
Serial No. ~~23~~ 24

No. 2053

Date of issue 27·3·23

Signed by Mr. T. E. J. Bryan

To

Endorsement granted to Syed Ishak, Makan Road, C & M Station, Bangalore, with ref. to his review application regd. no D. 1705 dt 1-3-1923 praying for a re-consideration of G.O. no. 1973/Muz. 32-13 dt 20 [illegible] applicant

over.

Syed Kutbuddin as Mujavar of Raja Hussain Dargah at Balapet, Bangalore.

In reply, Syed Ishak is informed that his petition is rejected as its presentation by a Pleader is invalid and cannot be recognized. ~~[illegible]~~ It is also out of time.

By order

24/3/23

Secretary. Rev. Dept.

24/3/23

List of enclosures.

12 D 2004

REV SECRETARIAT
23 APR 1923
MUZRAI

20.4.23 Muz/01-72-26.

ONE RUPEE

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

Miscellaneous Muzrai Petition

Presented by petitioner

8630-656.
21.4.23
To the Rev Secy with compliments.
This may be [illegible] in the usual course
20.4.23

PETITIONER
SYED ISHAK,
Makan Road,
C.&.M.Station,
Bangalore.

OPPONENT
SYED KUDBUDDIN,
Raja Husain Durgah,
Balepet,
Bangalore.

M/01-22-32

D.1705

The petitioner above named humbly beg to submit as follows:-

(1) Order No.1973/Muz.32-13-16 dated 20th October '21 regarding the appointment of the Muzavarship for the Raja Husain Durgah, Balepet, Bangalore City has been based on the allegation that the petitioner's father Syed Abdul - Khadar, was the cousin of the Late Syed Khasim,

(2) The petitioner's father and the said Syed Khasim were uterine brothers as is observed judicially by the IInd Munsiff BangaloreCity in the year 1896.

(3) The relationship of the parties as stated in the said order is entirely at varience with the facts and the findings of the Civil Court.

(4) The question of the status of the petitioner is involved in the matter under dispute and the present incorrect relationship as mentioned in the geniological table of the said order materially prejudices the future interests of the petitioner. Further the mention of such a relationship in public records proves highly detrimental to the future of the petitioner.

(5) The introduction of the word cousin in the geneological table was effected with the intention of defrauding the petitioner of a just rights to the Muzavarship of the Durgah referred to above.

(6) The petitioner has all along been aggitating over his present grievance being set right and his petitions are being disposed off against him without giving him a hearing. He is consequently put to the necessity of presenting this petition.

(7) The petitioner being obviously the son of Late Syed Kha Uterin brother is in Law and Equity entitled to the Muzavarshi of the Durgah.

(8) Wherefore the petitioner humbly prays that the question of relationship of the petitioner to the last holder of the Muzavarship be taken into consideration and the order referred to above be revised in its true light and further prays that any delay in the presentation of this petition may be graciou condoned and justice done to the petition.

Your most obedient servant,

سید شاہ محمد اسحاق

20th April 23 Sd.

(Syed Ishak)

Nakan Road,

C. & M. Station Bangalore

Muz 4]

SUBJECT Endorsement granted to Syed Issac, Makkan Road, C. & M. Station, Bangalore.

Diary No. of letter replied to 2004/22-23

Section

File No. 107-22

Serial No. 33

Muzrai Secretariat
( )
, *the* 192

No. 2798

Date of issue 16-5-23

Signed by M.R. T. E. J. Ayya

To

Endorsement granted to Syed Issac, Makkan Road, C. & M. Station, Bangalore,

With refce to his previous petition regd No. 2004 dated 20th April 1923, ~~stating that he is by law entitled to get the Mujavarship of the Raja Hussain Darga at Balepet, Bangalore City, and praying~~

praying that the post of the Mujavarship of the Raja Hussain Darga at Bangalore, may be conferred upon him,

over.

~~that the delay in the presentation of the petition may be condoned and that the post may be given to him,~~

the attention of Syed Isaac is ~~informed that~~ drawn to this Office Endt. No. 2553/Muz 101-22 of 27-3-23 rejecting his Petn. on the subject. There are no fresh grounds for reconsidering the orders already issued in the matter.

~~There are no fresh reasons forthcoming to reconsider this office Endt ~~orders~~ No. 2553/Muz 101-22-24 dated 27th March 1923, that his present petition has been filed 16 months after the Dy Commr.'s orders was appealed against passed. His petition is therefore rejected.~~

By Order,

Secretary to Govt,
Revenue Dept.

9/5/23

List of enclosures

2799 16-5-23

Copied by

Examined by

Copy to the Muzrai Commr. for infn.